

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/717,605	MARQUERING ET AL.	

  

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
NATHAN BLOOM	2624	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** After-Final

(1) NATHAN BLOOM. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Michael Monaco (Reg. 52041). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 15 December 2008

**Time:** 3:25 PM EST

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/NATHAN BLOOM/  
 Examiner, Art Unit 2624

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner explained that there was a 35 USC 101 issue with claim 1 based on the recent "tied-to" requirement for method claims. Examiner suggested an amendment to include a device/apparatus for performing the steps of the claim. Applicants proposed an examiner's amendment to correct the issue based on examiner's guidance (see attached Examiner's Amendment).